

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,748	7,748 07/09/2003		Marshall Medoff	08895-019002	9893
26161	7590	01/19/2006		EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC				PESELEV, ELLI	
P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1623	

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/615,748	MEDOFF ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Elli Peselev	1623		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. 9 period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	L. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)□	Since this application is in condition for allowar	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 30-35 and 54-56 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 30-35 and 54-56 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Applicati	on Papers				
10) 🔲	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
2) 🔲 Notica 3) 🔲 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) ' No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/615,748

Art Unit: 1623

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 30-35 and 54-56 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 and 21-23 of U.S. Patent No. 5,952,105. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed material is encompassed by the patented material.

Claims 30-35 and 54-56 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9-37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,207,729. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed material is encompassed by the patented material.

Claims 30-35 and 54-56 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousnesstype double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-49 of U.S. Patent No. Application/Control Number: 10/615,748

Art Unit: 1623

6,448,307. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed material is encompassed by the patented material.

Claims 30-35 and 54-56 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8, 14, 15, 50, 51 and 54-57 of copending Application No. 09/772,593. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the material claimed in the present application is encompassed by the material in the copending application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 30-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Jiang can be reached on (571) 272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/615,748 Page 4

Art Unit: 1623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Elli Peselev

ELLI PESELEV PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1200